DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 437 330 SO 031 357

AUTHOR Nelson, Murry R.
TITLE Foundational Dissertations in the Foundations of Social Studies.
PUB DATE 1999-00-00
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Doctoral Dissertations; Higher Education; *Intellectual Disciplines; Research Methodology; *Scholarship; *Social Studies; State of the Art Reviews

ABSTRACT

During the last five years the "house" of social studies has been and continues to be severely tested. Knowledge and depth of understanding of the foundations of the social studies may be key to promoting cohesion in the field and lessen the possibility of severe damage or destruction. This paper presents some of the most frequently cited dissertations in the field. The 14 studies described in the paper are those that graduate students and other researchers have found to be the most useful in establishing the origins of key ideas and directions of the foundations of social studies. The paper synthesizes three notions from each of the dissertations: (1) purpose; (2) design; and (3) significance to foundations of social studies. Following the three notions, the paper addresses common themes or patterns. The dissertations are examined in the paper in chronological order according to the date each was written, not according to the period about which the study was written. (Contains 20 references.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 437 330

Foundational Dissertations in the Foundations of Social Studies.

by

Murry R. Nelson
College of Education
Pennsylvania State University

SO 031 357

Murry R.
Nelson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Foundational Dissertations in the Foundations of Social Studies

Abraham Lincoln in assaying the likely prospect of Civil War observed that "a house divided against itself cannot stand." During the last five years the "house" of social studies has been and continues to be severely tested. Ultimately, the strength of a house subjected to great stress may lie in the foundation. So too with social studies. A knowledge and depth of understanding of the foundations of the social studies may be key to promoting cohesion in the field and lessen the possibility of severe damage or destruction.

Unfortunately, information about foundational notions of the social studies is not easily obtained. There are few books devoted to foundations and, although the number is significantly increased over the past 15 years, few scholarly articles whose authors speak to the topic. Foundational beliefs are fraught with mythologies and misconceptions e.g., many people widely quote the ideas of the Committee on the Social Studies Report of 1916, but much of the commentary indicates that few have actually read the report. Thus, the best in-depth studies in the foundations of social studies are found in doctoral dissertations. The problem is that the people who read dissertations are primarily other graduate students.

In this brief essay I will attempt to present some of the most frequently cited dissertations in the field. This is not a review of the content of these studies. The studies described herein are those that my graduate students, other researchers in the foundations of social studies and I have found to be the most useful in establishing the origins of key ideas and directions that are in the foundations of social studies. I have chosen not to focus on those studies whose major ideas have been widely disseminated by the authors in some other forum nor studies so recent as not to be yet examined and cited by the field.

In the latter group would come Stephen P. Correia's, *For Their Own Good: An Historical Analysis of the Educational Thought of Thomas Jesse Jones*, completed in 1993 at the Pennsylvania State University which may prove to be a very useful study to future scholars.

The former group includes Samuel S. Shermis' 1961 dissertation from the University of Kansas, *John Dewey's Social and Political Philosophy: Its Implications for Social Studies Education.* Shermis has co-written at least one book and one National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) bulletin on the foundations of the field and has discussed his views there and in numerous articles.

My 1975 dissertation study, *Building a Science of Society: The Social Studies and Harold O. Rugg*, has also been distilled in a number of articles and, thus, will not be examined in this essay. So too with the 1988 dissertation of David Saxe, *Traditional History and the Social Studies in Secondary Education: A Historical Perspective*, which was published as Social Studies in Schools: A History of the Early Years (1991) and will also not be examined here. Similarly with Leo LeRiche's dissertation, *The Widening Horizons Concept in Elementary Social Studies Education, 1903-1965.*

Of the 14 dissertations scrutinized here few were presented in published forums and, of those, much important data were not made accessible because of lack of space in journal articles.

In this essay I will try to synthesize three notions from each of the dissertations—purpose, design and significance to foundations of social studies. After those are discussed, common themes or patterns will be addressed. The dissertations will be initially examined in order of chronology, that is when each was written, not the period about which the study was written.

The Dissertations

Agnew O. Roorbach, *The Development of Social Studies in American Secondary Education before 1861* (1937). Anyone even remotely familiar with the field would find Roorbach's title and premise intriguing since social studies was not a term used until at least twenty years later and not popularly applied to social studies for at least fifty years.[1] To what then does Roorbach refer? Using a definition of social studies popular in the 1930s, Roorbach sought "to reconstruct a true record of certain social studies as they developed in secondary

[1] See Saxe, D. W., Social Studies in Schools, Chapter 1, SUNY Albany Press, 1991.

education before 1861" (Roorbach, 5). The definition Roorbach used was adopted from William Kimmell's monograph of 1932 which stated:

> The social studies in the secondary school comprise a group of subjects including history, civics, economics and sociology with certain relatively undefined boundaries and ramifications in the subject matter of geography, vocation, ethics and home making.

Roorbach's academic work was done at the University of Pennsylvania, one of the first and finest programs in social studies education. It was the academic home of Albert E. McKinley, one of the founders and the first president of the National Council for the Social Studies and the managing editor of The History Teacher's Magazine from 1909 through its change to The Historical Outlook from 1918 to 1933.

Roorbach's work was a historical study wherein he looked at social studies as the informal education of the people and, in that context, determined geographic, governmental and political economic interests in colonial America by studying the works of colonial historians. He also studied 316 issues of colonial newspapers of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, South Carolina and Georgia for advertisements on the sale of imported books. Those dealing with any phase of social studies were tabulated and included in Roorbach's study. He examined 610 nineteenth century almanacs to note and include their content on history, geography, government and economics. These were pre formal subject study.

Roorbach studied 1128 textbooks and over 600 catalogues of academies, seminaries and high schools in 23 states and the District of Columbia. A summary of Roorbach's course findings is shown as Table One. Also examined were a number of National Committee Reports from both the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Historical Association (AHA).

GRAPH SHOWING % OF COURSES OFFERING

300 COURSES OF STUDY
235 ACADEMIES, SEMINARIES AND HIGH SCHOOLS.

THE SOCIAL STUDIES
1820-1860

23 STATES AND DC
REPRESENTING STUDENTS
FROM 29 STATES.

	HISTORY	%
1	Grecian Antiquities	9
2	Roman Antiquities	13
3	Sacred Antiquities	2
4	Ancient Antiquities	1
5	History of Greece	14
6	History of Rome	15
7	Universal or General History	43
8	Ancient History	17
9	Medieval History	3
10	Modern History	9
11	History of England	21
12	History of France	5
13	History of Scotland	2
14	History of New England	1
15	History of A single Federated State	3
16	Chronology	4
17	Biography	4
18	Ecclesiastical History	8
19	History of the United States	58
20	History of Civilization	4
21	Ancient and Modern History	7
22	Mythology	12
23	History (not specified)	10
	GEOGRAPHY	
1	Geography	63
2	Ancient Geography	31
3	Modern Geography	14
4	Sacred Geography	4
5	Ancient and Modern Geography	2
6	Political Geography	3
7	Mathematical Geography	3
8	Physical Geography	13
9	Universal Geography	3
10	Globes and Maps	4
11	Medieval and Ancient Geography	1
	CIVICS	
1	Civics	26
2	Constitution of the United States	7
3	Constitution of a Single State	4
4	Town and Municipal Government	1
5	legal Rights	2
6	Legal Rights of Women	2
7	Civics or Political Science in Any Forum	32
	POLITICAL ECONOMY	
1	Political Economy	30

MENTAL and MORAL PHILOSOPHY

1	Mental Philosophy	66
2	Watt's Improvement of the Mind	25
3	Logic	44
4	Ethics	1
5	Moral Philosophy	62
6	Evidences of Christianity	36
7	Natural Theology	19
8	Analogy	19

BIBLE

1	Bible - Old and New Testaments	9

PHILOSOPHY

1	Philosophy	3
2	History of Philosophy	1
3	Philosophy of History	2

DOMESTIC ECONOMY

1	Domestic economy	2
2	Needle-work	2

Roorbach's work is significant because it is essentially the only work that focuses on the social sciences in schools before 1861. His work is also one of the earliest studies that addresses the foundational thought of social studies. Roorbach chronicles courses, textbooks and methods that shaped the field of social studies in the eighteen and nineteenth centuries. He examines each subject—history, geography, civic education, mental philosophy and political economy—for these same factors. Thus, the study is invaluable for the historical perspective it provides as well as its early materials and methods. Roorbach also provides an introduction to some less well known pioneers of social studies education and their works. My first encounter with Emma Willard who founded the Troy Female Seminary in 1821 and authored widely used school textbooks in history and geography, was in reading Roorbach's dissertation. Willard's "Temple of Time," a chart chronicling an original plan for teaching history is described and pictured in Roorbach's study. He also introduces the work of early American educators like Noah Webster, William Grimshaw, Charles Goodrich and Eliza Robbins all of whom wrote popular textbooks in history and examines the work of geographers like Jedidiah Morse and William Woodbridge.

The appendices list history textbooks used or published in the U. S. prior to 1861, geography texts from that same period, civics textbooks from the period and textbooks on political economy for the period prior to 1861. These and the excellent bibliography above make Roorbach's work extremely valuable.

Leo Alilunas, *Genesis of the Social Studies Movement in American Secondary Education* (1946).

Alilunas sought to investigate the use and background of the new social studies in American secondary schools. He begins where Roorbach leaves off, at about the mid nineteenth century and continues his study through the mid 1920s.

Alilunas examined the addresses, proceedings and various committee reports of the National Education Association. In addition, he studied various bulletins of the U. S. Bureau of Education, reports of the U. S. Commissioner of Education, and annual proceedings and committee reports of the American Historical Association, the National Municipal League, the

North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and a number of state and regional history teachers associations' reports. Early NCSS, National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE), National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and American Sociological Society yearbooks and reports also were scrutinized in an effort to discover early references to and development of the social studies movement in the U. S.

Unlike Roorbach, Alilunas was much more interested in the ideas that shaped the social studies movement. Alilunas saw his study as being very timely in the 1940s, a period in which social studies was under attack by right wing forces who thought that there was a need for a return to traditional values and the study of old fashioned history study. Attacks on Harold Rugg and his materials and Paul Hanna and his materials were fomented by the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Legion and other conservative groups. Alilunas felt that educators, and the public at times, had lost sight of the factors responsible for the past development of the social sciences and secondary school subjects. The study does an admirable job of chronicling this development and the reasons why social studies developed in contrast to a curriculum "heavily loaded with history and a point of view which stressed history for history's sake" (Alilunas, 3).

Alilunas' work is well researched and documented and is useful for interested scholars in the foundations of social studies. After initial definitions and curricular organization discussions (circa 1860-1916), he traces, in successive chapters, the influence of college entrance requirements, historians, psychologists, Dewey, new history, and American social and economic thought upon curriculum making in secondary schools during the period from 1890 to 1900. A later chapter is a brief but useful overview of the Committee on Social Studies Report of 1916 and the response of historians to that report from 1916 to 1924.

The study of Andrew N. Cruikshanks, *The Social Studies Curriculum in the Secondary Schools, 1893-1955* (1957) was an extension of Roorbach's but for the thirty years from 1861 to 1892. Cruikshanks was interested in the curriculum itself much as Roorbach was and less interested in assessing the curriculum or its impact. He states that his purpose is not to evaluate

the curriculum past or present, but rather to present "the content of the curriculum rather than . . . organizational patterns" (3). Through his study Cruikshanks hoped to aid in clarifying what constituted the field of social studies, "to identify general trends in changes of content and emphases; to understand more readily the general relationship between major social changes and the social studies curriculum" (5-6).

Cruikshanks' examined AHA, NSSE, NCSS reports and journals such as Historical Outlook, Education, The Social Studies, Social Education and School and Society as well as yearbooks and curriculum series of NCSS, relevant theses, city and state reports. Since there was widespread acknowledgment that the textbooks are what most courses are organized around, Cruikshanks also examined and analyzed representational texts in terms of both content and emphasis (8). Available courses of study were also analyzed.

Cruikshanks hoped that his study might "shed some light on what ought to be included in social studies in the years that lie ahead" by indicating what had been in the field of social studies curriculum (238).

Cruikshanks' study is still very useful in studying foundations of the field. He presents many useful tables summarizing the offerings of courses in cities or states and the coverage of topics in various texts (e.g. Table 2). Most of these are summaries of other studies, but many are done by Cruikshanks.

Also provided are breakouts of curricular recommendations of various committees concerned with secondary schools such as that of the American Political Science Association of 1916 on the Teaching of Government, the Committee of Ten of 1893, the 1916 Report on the Social Studies of the NEA Committee on the Reorganization of Secondary Education.

Individual social science course content is scrutinized and he also investigates many of the 1930s AHA Commission on the Social Studies volumes.

Especially useful is the last chapter in which Cruikshanks summarizes the changes and trends of the secondary social studies curriculum broken out into eras. These are 1893-1915, 1916-1930, 1931-1940, 1941-1955. He then follows with an excellent bibliography containing

TABLE 2
AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF LINES DEVOTED BY FOUR TEXTBOOKS
TO THE FOLLOWING TOPICS

Topic	Percentage of Lines
Development of Principles of Government	2.57
Local Government	3.71
State Government	4.05
National Government	12.77
Political Parties and Elections	4.50
Taxation	2.86
International Relations	5.33
Industry	10.13
Transportation	2.53
Labor Relations	5.82
Immigration	2.63
Conservation	2.97
Population	5.79
Family	4.76
Church	1.81
Education	4.97
Poverty	5.18
Crime	3.88
Health and Care of Defectives	2.11
Communication	.11
Recreation	.22
Liquor Problems	.88

From Cruikshanks, A. N. "The Social Studies Curriculum in the Secondary School, 1893-1955," p. 91.

most appreciated citations of useful reports and proceedings, many of which would not have been discovered or cited were it not for the excellent library at Stanford's School of Education. The textbooks and courses of study (27 from 15 states) are similar in their rarity and import.

Louis M. Vanaria's dissertation, *The National Council for the Social Studies: A Voluntary Organization for Professional Service*, traces the antecedents of NCSS and the history of the organization until the mid 1950s. Because of Vanaria's design there is both more and less than one might desire in such a study.

Vanaria develops a historical case study using correspondence of past presidents, early secretaries and later executive secretaries, annual reports, speeches, committee reports, financial statements, constitutions, meeting programs and various memoranda. Vanaria used Merrill Hartshorne's (executive secretary of NCSS at the time) files, interviewed other members and had access to NCSS publications and archives housed at Columbia. Working with Erling Hunt (another former NCSS executive secretary) gave Vanaria great interpretive advantages.

The organization leaves much to be desired. Rather than a strict chronology, Vanaria offers two chapters of the background and expansion of NCSS totaling about 100 pages. He then addresses various services of NCSS such as the work of the executive secretaries, Social Education, annual meetings, committee work and overall leadership in chapters of varying (22 to 60 pages) length. Each chapter is interesting, but the overlapping chronologies make finding particular things such as the involvement of individuals difficult because of a lack of an index. The dissertation has much more contemporary (that is mid-1950s) views of the Council than historical views.

Vanaria's study frames NCSS within the context of voluntary associations and professional activities in American education. He initially traces the movement toward professionalism by examining the creation and growth of state and local teachers' associations, the National Education Association and scholarly associations like the American Historical Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Sociological Society.

The founding of the NCSS, then, is seen as a natural extension/combination of these education and scholarly professional efforts.

It is interesting to compare the services provided by NCSS in his earliest years and how they were redefined or reshaped by the vision of later NCSS members. The dramatic change in the NCSS annual conference which actually began as a series of smaller meetings held in conjunction with the NEA's Department of Superintendance, the NEA's summer meeting and the AHA's annual meeting is quite pronounced. Vanaria shows much of this growth and development.

Also interesting are the various committees originally formed within NCSS and how their structure function and control changed over the years from 1920 to 1950. Any social studies scholar will see remarkable contrasts between the NCSS of 1921-1950 and today.

Robert E. Newman, Jrs'. dissertation, *History of a Civic Education Project: Implementing the Social Problem Technique of Instruction* , is easily overlooked as an important case study in the foundations of the field. Because the topic of Newman's work, a national periodical for school use called Building America, had been the subject of a bitter fight in California only ten years or so prior to his study and because a right wing provocateur who attacked the periodical still lived nearby, Newman was requested and advised by both his adviser, Richard Gross, and one of the co-directors of the project, Paul. R. Hanna, to make his title vague intentionally .

Newman's study, then, is limited to the "organization and description, background and history of Building America and the events which contributed to its discontinuance" (Newman, vii). Newman saw the value of his study just as Cruikshanks viewed his, though Newman was a bit more specific in hoping that from his study educators might "be able to develop helpful guidelines for successful future citizenship education programs centering upon the great issues of the era" (vii).

Though Newman's design and method are historical, he views them as more "reportorial rather than attempting to develop implications or interpretations directly from the incidents

described." This was due to the potential of reopening recent "wounds" and to avoid further conflict he avoided potentially derisive interviewing.

The study consists of two parts, first the history of the project from its inception in the late 1930s until its "difficulties" in 1948 and second, the conflict itself. In providing a periodical for middle grade school use, it was decided to focus on a topic in depth as an issue. The topics or issues included Bread, Newspapers, TVA Development, Fruit, Oil, Shipbuilding, Coal, Housing, Oil, The Meat Industry, Transportation, Food, and Men (sic) and Machines, among others.

Despite these seemingly appropriate and innocuous topics, the California State Senate's Investigating Committee on Education found at least fifty of Building America's authors to be affiliated with so called Communist front organizations. These authors included Charles and Mary Beard, Sherwood Anderson, Pearl Buck, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, James Weldon Johnson, Helen and Robert Lynd, Oliver La Farge, Lewis Mumford, Frank Lloyd Wright, Lincoln Steffens, Lin Yu Tang and Margaret Bourke White (Newman, 428).

Though the Committee couldn't link Professor Hanna to Communism, they noted that the educators involved had been "fooled" (428-29). They traced Hanna's lineage from the "radical educators" Counts and Kilpatrick who had been instrumental in the founding of the John Dewey Society in which Hollis Caswell was a prominent member for whom Paul Hanna worked as a consultant on the Virginia State Curriculum in the 1930s (Newman, 432).

The destruction of Building America like that of the Rugg curriculum eight years before (Nelson, 1975, 1977) was fait accompli once the political and business organizations combined money and influence in the pursuit of the material's demise. Newman's chronicling of these events is meticulous and thorough, worthy of study by anyone interested in the charged issue of infusing "controversial" topics into the curriculum.

Howard R. Boozer's, *The American Historical Association and the Schools, 1884-1956* is perhaps the most important dissertation in the foundations of the field. This work has been vital in providing foundational understandings in social studies by focusing on the AHA and its relationship to the schools from the time of the AHA's founding until the mid 1950s.

In the course of tracing this relationship Boozer also develops many issues of at least tangential import and often of much greater significance. The development of NCSS within the AHA and its subsequent interactions with the AHA after establishing itself within the National Education Association (NEA) are examined. The interests of the other major social science organizations (the American Political Science Association, the American Sociological Association, etc.) in the schools during the period in question are also presented.

This study is much less concerned with curriculum and organizational patterns and much more so with people and organizational actions in the approximately 75 year period. The purpose of Boozer's work is to study the practical efforts to improve the schools and school teaching on the part of the AHA.

Even the appendix with its brief chronology of The History Teachers Magazine and its evolution to Historical Outlook, The Social Studies and the creation of Social Education is useful and vital.

Boozer's historical design is carried out in a thoroughly impressive manner. He examines all AHA published documents that addressed school matters. Those include AHA committee reports and publications, annual reports of the AHA, American Historical Review (the Association's quarterly journal) proceedings of AHA conferences and major journals for social studies and history teachers (Historical Outlook, History Teacher's Magazine, Social Studies, Social Education). Though, as noted, this is not a curriculum study or one of teacher education, these threads do "run throughout and because of their inherent relationship no effort has been made to separate them" (Boozer, 8).

It is difficult to express how significant the study is to foundations of social studies. The footnotes alone (about 150 per chapter), provide tremendous insight and detail. In examining AHA work Boozer has also sought critical reviews of these works of the time. Needless to say, Boozer cites all original source documentation as well as secondary and tertiary interpretations

and reviews. Boozer's study has only one real shortcoming—it ends in 1956. An extension from that time to the present era is vitally needed and is currently being undertaken.[2]

Glenn Kinzie's, *Historians and the Social Studies: A History and Interpretation of the Activities of the American Historical Association in the Secondary School Social Studies, 1884-1964*, covers much of the same territory as Boozer did and not nearly as thoroughly. Kinzie states his purpose is "to trace the development and recommendations of the four major study groups of the AHA which dealt with secondary school social studies." These are presented in the context of secondary education and social and intellectual developments of American society. Kinzie, unlike Boozer, is more concerned with the educational philosophy of the AHA, the external factors that affected the work of the AHA in this area and the reaction of the AHA to growth of NCSS.

As did Boozer, Kinzie examined the Annual Reports of the AHA, History Teachers Magazine, Historical Outlook, Social Education and American Historical Review as well as the most noted AHA Reports (Committee of Seven, 1899; Committee of Five, 1911; The History Inquiry, 1924; the Commission on the Social Studies of the 1930s, but only nine of the seventeen volumes). Because the Committee of Eight addressed elementary schools, it was not examined. Kinzie's study of less than 200 pages is less than half the length of Boozer's work. The Commission on the Social Studies reports of the 1930s encompass 35 pages of text with reactions to it comparing another 25 pages. This is one third of the study, but still far less than these works warrant.

Kinzie acknowledges his debt to Boozer in this study, then tries to go beyond that other work by providing statements on educational philosophy from Butts and Cremin, V. T. Thayer and Ralph Henry Gabriel. Though Boozer did not do this, Kinzie's study adds little of significance to the foundations of the field. Kinzie does make a couple useful, insightful comments. He notes that the AHA sought to develop critical thinking and effective citizenship and, in that, the AHA was "no more successful than other groups in clarifying the nature and

---

[2]Mraz, Mark. Dissertation in progress, Penn State University.

character of the good citizen" (Kinzie, 180-181). He concludes that the AHA's efforts were a failure, but still held out hope for success (190-192). Kinzie notes that any attempts at remaking society through education "normally require the moral face of the great majority of the population in the society" (191). This had already been concluded by Counts in 1933 in Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? which Kinzie acknowledges.

The bibliography is disappointing with no previously unnoted sources and not very many cited. This was a work that never seemed to reach appropriate depth.

Ray Hiner's, *The Changing Role of History and Social Sciences in the Schools, 1892-1918*, also seems to cover the same intellectual ground as that which both Boozer and Kinzie did. However, unlike Kinzie's work, Hiner's is a valuable complement to Boozer's study with greater depth and scope but a more limited chronology.

Hiner's purpose was "to ascertain the role of history and social sciences in the schools (1892-1918) as expressed in the reports by committees of selected professional organizations and in the dialogue which accompanied them in professional journals" (10). He achieves this notably through examining more than just reports but original archival documents, philosophical schools of educational thought and the underpinnings to the reports in question.

The study is historical and chronologically tight; Hiner only deviates from his stated time period to provide understandings to the development to the initial formations of the professional organizations in the study. The American Historical Association (AHA) founded in 1884, the American Economic Association (AEA) in 1885, the American Anthropological Association (AAA) in 1902, the American Political Science Association (APSA) in 1903 and the American Sociological Society (ASS) in 1905 are chronicled in their early years with the most attention paid to the former and commensurately lesser attention to the latter four in descending increments from the AEA to the ASS.

As noted, this study complements Boozer's work very well by examining in greater depth what Boozer had only briefly (if at all) examined. Thus, Herbert Baxter Adams, Frederick Jackson Turner, James Harvey Robinsion, Albert Bushnell Hart are studied in their relation to the

formation of the AHA and then they are used as a segue way to the study of the Committee of Ten. Boozer's work here was relatively brief and superficial. Hiner's is much more detailed and relied on the Eliot papers at Harvard for archival insights.

Hiner continues his AHA connections to the formation of the AHA's views on teaching methods, curricular organization and purposes of history and how these influenced the Committee of Seven in 1899. Of similar significance to foundations' scholars are Hiner's treatments of the formation of the AEA's concerns for schools; the APSA's Committee of Five (1908), "The Teaching of Government in Secondary Schools"; the expressed concerns of anthropologists regarding school study and, finally, the emerging concerns of sociologists. These latter are then carried through to the Committee on Economy of Time in Education which led to the NEA Report on the Social Studies of 1916.

This latter issue is only superficially addressed and, in essence, ends the study. The years 1917 and 1918 are not addressed so the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education are not a subject of Hiner's scrutiny. Hiner concludes that revisionist historians like Becker, Beard, Hayes and Muzzey sought more synthesis in history teaching in schools. Despite support from such historians and the AHA Committee on History and Education for citizenship, the AHA Executive Council did not accept the Committee report. Historians, it was noted, "were not ready for the radical changes proposed" (Hiner, 204).

Hiner's study is much briefer (200 pages) than Boozer's but Hiner's limited scope makes for a more readable, valuable dissertation. In addition he has provided a bibliography with depth and access to archival sources such as the Charles W. Eliot papers at Harvard and records on the reorganization of secondary education 1915-1923 located at the National Archives. The original reports cited above are also augmented by descriptions or critiques of these reports as published in professional journals at that time. These primary sources comprise over half the bibliography of over twenty pages.

Patricia Glasheen's, *The Advent of Social Studies, 1916: An Historical Study*, might seem to fit well following Boozer's and Hiner's work. Unfortunately, that is not the case. The stated

purpose is to examine the beginnings of social studies education in this country through three channels. One is historical antecedents of the components of the social studies. A second is through examining the social, educational and personal factors that produced social studies as a new subject. And third, by examining practices and events related to the notion of social studies as presented in the 1916 Report.

Glasheen's historical design involved examination of primary source material on the Committee on Reorganization of Secondary Education, other NEA proceedings and addresses, Historical Outlook and yearbooks of the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE). The examination of the personal letters of Dunn, Kingsley and others on the 1916 Committee as well as the minutes of the reviewing committee are welcome, but the study does not succeed.

Too much is attempted in this brief (205 page) work and little new, useful research is offered. Even original source material is merely presented, neither analyzed nor connected to other studies. One half of this study is background information of education and of society.

Glasheen's conclusion that the 1916 Committee Report may have had some effect (but no causal connections are offered) is both obvious and disappointing. Some useful textbooks are cited in the bibliography as well as some dissertations that may prove useful. These include one on the reorganization of English teachers, 1910-1917 (Robert S. Fay), one on the development of methods in the teaching of school geography (Lorrin G. Kennamer, Jr.) and one on the doctrines of Herbart in the U. S. (George B. Randels). Hiner's study is much briefer (200 pages) than Boozer's but Hiner's limited scope makes for a more readable, valuable dissertation.
There is little in Glasheen's work for researchers in foundations of social studies.

H. Wells Singleton's, *Factors Affecting the Development of the Problems of Democracy Course*, extended the notions generally addressed by Cruikshanks in 1957 while providing a case study of one course, the Problems of Democracy (POD) in grade twelve.

Singleton's stated purpose was to find the major factors affecting course development and he saw three areas as constituting such major factors—1) developmental issues within the field itself, 2) laws and ordinances of states, 3) curriculum guides and texts. He takes a "chronological

approach with the topics emphasized with each period of time" (Singleton, 3). The study begins prior to 1916 when the POD course was first proposed in the Committee Report on the Social Studies and traces his study to the present (1970).

Singleton sees curricular study of one course in social studies as important in order to "enable developers, teachers and administrators to more clearly see what is involved in meaningful change" (4). In a sense, this study is a case study analogous to that of Newman whose dissertation is prominently cited and discussed by Singleton (pp. 140-143).

The historical design necessitated the examination of journals, books, NCSS publications, dissertations, curriculum guides and textbooks. The latter two were more practitioner oriented in their points of view, the former ones more philosophical in outlook.

Singleton's study is still significant because of its source material and the implications inherent in the POD course, one invented in 1916 and identified by many as the essence of the notion of social studies, an idea developed further in Evans' dissertation (discussed later) which reexamined much of the material Singleton presented.

The criticisms of the POD course in various eras provide a useful critical perspective and point up analogies to perceived shortcomings in such courses today. These include vague content, poor teacher training and the superfluous need for such a course. In the context of various eras Singleton examines pressure groups and legislation affecting social studies, a timely and useful offering. Singleton notes that it is "possible that whole staffs have lost an understanding of the theory and purpose of the social studies in secondary school" (180), an observation certainly valid today.

In concluding, Singleton relates the success of the POD course to the success of the Progressive Education Movement, to philosophical differences that caused POD to be advocated to greater or lesser degrees and to impacting legislation and pressure groups.

Paul Robinson's, *Historical Models of the Emergence of the Social Studies*, is a study that succeeds. Neither a curriculum examination nor a chronological history, Robinson instead constructs models by synthesizing his studies of the origins of the field of social studies.

The purposes of the study are modestly stated, that is, to shed light on the historicism of the curriculum field in general and social studies in particular and to present the political dimensions of the curriculum. Clearly influenced by Michael Kirst, David Tyack and other professors at Stanford who first presented these views of the curriculum in the early 1970s, Robinson applies them well to social studies. Robinson states (10):

> An assumption of this study is that the question of what sort of social studies curriculum a school should maintain—indeed whether the social studies as a subject of the school curriculum should even be created—was an issue of public policy-making which generated abundant conflict. Examination of that conflict should tell us much about the origins of the social studies, the social and cultural contexts in which it emerged, and the linkages between the curriculum and the culture.

Robinson examines three competing models of social studies and, for each, notes strengths and weaknesses and "what sorts of evidence each calls attention to at the expense of other possible data" (12). Model in Robinson's sense is synonymous with theory of interpretation or historical frame of reference. These models—conventional, revisionist and cultural politics—are examined through the use of primary sources—periodicals, articles, committee reports, books and personal reminiscences from 1890 to 1920 which related to the origins of the social studies in its cultural context. An unusual addition to Robinson's examinations was the scrutiny of advertisements in educational periodicals for social studies books and materials. The use of secondary sources such as seminal historical interpretations of the emergence of the social studies, works of leading revisionist historians and additional books, dissertations, articles, and reports which shed light on social studies was another part of Robinson's method.

Robinson's study remains significant first for its technique, its synthesized view of the field combining curricular understanding and chronological occurrences. Robinson assesses how successful the social studies was in achieving the functions that it was called upon to serve at the time of its emergence as a field.

Using his models approach Robinson demonstrates that "the role of external, social, economic and intellectual conditions are of first rate importance for understanding the

development of the social studies within the schools" (200). And, finally, Robinson concludes with an observation that continues to hold true nearly twenty years later. "The frequent attempts to invigorate or revitalize the social studies curriculum have been overstated and not too successful. In spite of the rhetoric of good citizenship formation, the social studies has remained a traditional subject matter course" (203).

Michael Lybarger's, *Origins of the Social Studies Curriculum: 1865-1916*, had highly original theorizing and thorough, original research with "less cited" archival sources.

Lybarger took social studies as interpreted by the social reformers active in the Committee of 1916 Report, then posed the following question. "How did it come about that a subject and a course of study designed for former slaves, their children and wards of the government came to be considered appropriate for all children in American schools" (2)?

In answering that question, Lybarger tries to understand the origins of early social studies ideas, tries to articulate the social and political implications of those early ideas with a view to understanding them as part of a broader context and tries to show that early social studies ideas were the property of particular social groups for whom they served to legitimate prevailing social and political arrangements (Lybarger, 27). The key to all this is the Committee on Social Studies of 1916 as well as the sources and contexts of that Committee.

Lybarger's work is significant because of its meticulous historical research which provides lessons for today's curriculum workers and greater understanding in viewing changes (actual and proposed) for social studies today. Lybarger's tracings of the movement of ideas from one person or group of persons to another is quite significant, though still, to a degree, speculative.

The connections between the sociologist, Franklin Giddings, and his students lead through the Hampton Institute and Thomas Jesse Jones and on through to many of the members of the Committee on the Social Studies of 1916. Lybarger examines the American Social Science Association, the National Municipal League and the commensurate efforts of settlement workers in helping urban residents and immigrants.

As in Boozer and Hiner's work Lybarger's dissertation is valuable in a holistic manner, i.e. for the larger story it tells, for the archival sources exposed and for the synthesizing research undertaken. No understanding of the 1916 Report is complete without examining and considering Lybarger's work.

Of less import, but still of note is Thomas Peet's, *A Selective History of Social Studies Scope and Sequence Patterns, 1916 to 1984*. Peet's purpose is to inform regarding various efforts in scope and sequence patterns that have been tried over a nearly 70 year period. Thus, he hopes others will avoid "reinventing the wheel."

Using historical inquiry Peet selects one alternative curriculum pattern per decade and examines each of these thoroughly, subjecting them to a critical review. His sources include dissertations, reviews of social studies research, social studies/history teacher periodicals and national, state and city surveys. Many of these surveys have received scant attention and Peet's scrutiny may allow for further examination by other scholars.

The key word in Peet's research is "selected." This is not, nor does it claim to be, a comprehensive survey. Peet's critical reviews of the curricular patterns are the most significant contribution to the foundations of the field. For those unfamiliar with these curriculum, he offers needed citations and commentary. For those already familiar he adds his views.

Works examined included the Committees of Ten (NEA) and Seven (AHA), Eight (AHA), the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship (1921) and Civic Education in Indianapolis (Dunn, 1915). Hanna's model as well as Taba's are presented with commentary and illustrations. Project Social Studies (1965), NCSS Scope and Sequence (1984) and the NCSS volume The Future of the Social Studies (1939) are also given varying degrees of scrutiny. Indeed it is the reproduction of tables and models that make this a useful and lengthy dissertation study. Peet, for example, summarizes in tabular form, all of the chapter authors" suggestions from The Future of the Social Studies. These authors include Roy Hatch, R. O. Hughes, Mary Kelty, A. C. Krey, L. C. Marshall, Frances Morehouse, I. James Quillen, Harold Rugg, Howard Wilson and Earle Rugg. Paul Hanna's Virginia Curriculum (1934), a precursor of the larger

expanding communities model is presented and contrasted with his later models of 1953, 1956 and 1963. Hanna continued to tinker with this model until his death in 1988.

Peet's brief conclusion only began to explain why attempts at social studies scope and sequence have ultimately failed. He is convinced one model is neither desirable nor feasible, yet the brief explanation of a Jacksonian heritage and multiple historical perspectives are never developed sufficiently.

Ronald Evans', *Defining the Worthy Society: A History of the Societal Problems Approach in the Social Studies*, was one that I considered not including because Evans has published derivative pieces in The Social Studies and Theory and Research in Social Education. Nevertheless I felt that his study still warranted attention because of his methods used.

Evans' purpose was straightforward—to explain the origins and development of the problems approach, to critically analyze the problems selected for study and to identify the ideology reflected in specific problems (Evans, 1). Evans sought to accomplish this through a new twist on an old design—textbook analysis. Examined were texts from various eras—1895-1916, 1917-1930, 1931-1939, 1940-45, 1946-60, 1961-70, 1971-85 as well as specific course offerings described in journal articles from the periods in question.

Evans calculated the percentage of space and the detailed analysis of 135 texts and displayed the results in tabular and graphic form via a spreadsheet computer program. He provides excellent text exposure and critical analyses of a number of noted textbooks in secondary social studies. Evans limited the study primarily to Problems of Democracy textbooks, civics textbooks, some social problems texts and some recent issue centered pamphlets. As an interesting point of comparison, Evans compared text space allocation to public opinion polls of the various periods that identified problems as well as political party platforms.

Evans provides excellent sources for his study. The textbooks from the various periods from 1895-1985 are a useful complement to Roorbach's textbook list, though not nearly as comprehensive a list. So, too, with Evans' bibliography which cites useful older journal articles

and more recent assessments. Unfortunately the bibliography is not broken out by primary and secondary sources nor is there a category of dissertations.

Evans' work is quite useful, particularly if one wishes to find some foundational support for the proposals that he has offered in published works regarding social problems. Unfortunately, Evans does not carry his analysis far enough. His analysis of the time periods that he selects is very brief and not very thought provoking.

More attention to that would be helpful in accepting his assertions of the text analyses. Also needed was a more developed, analytical set of conclusions. Evans notes that "treatment of societal problems was determined largely by the internal norms of educators, their values, educational philosophy and political beliefs and their perception of the problems of American society" (206-7). Neither this statement nor his conclusion that "text contents change slowly and do not follow public opinion which is more volatile" are surprising. They say more about the naiveté and cautiousness of the author than they do of the topic. But, that could be said about many dissertations, including most of those examined in this piece.

Patterns, Emphases and Conclusions

What can one make of all these studies, especially regarding further research in the area. First, certain works are relied upon for generalizations and directions in the field. These—the NEA Committee of Ten Report of 1893, the AHA Committees of Seven (1899), Five (1912) and possibly Eight (1905), the NEA Committee on the Social Studies (1916), the AHA's History Inquiry (1924) and Commission on the Social Studies (1930s) warrant reading and contextual analysis by researchers before probing the dissertations in this essay. Without prior readings, the researcher is left to the interpretive biases of the various dissertation writers in lieu of primary source documentation. Certainly no researcher in the history of any field would rely exclusively on secondary sources for information. The dissertation writers did not and that pattern should not be lost on any future researchers.

The patterns of study fall into three or four categories. In no order of import, they are curriculum and/or texts, organizational/institutional history, case study and philosophical

placement. Some crossed these arbitrary borders and fell within more than one category. The curricular history/text analyses include Roorbach's study; Alilunas, to a degree; Cruikshanks, Singleton, somewhat; Lybarger, to a degree; Peet's and Evans' studies. More institutional or organizational histories included Boozer's work as well as that of Vanaria, Hiner, Lybarger and Kinzie. Newmann, Singleton, Glasheen, and Vanaria provided case studies to a greater or lesser degree while Robinson offered a philosophical view of the formation of the field of social studies.

Institutionally there are really no patterns to discern other than the fact that five of the dissertations were written by doctoral students at Stanford University. Three or four of those were supervised by Richard Gross (Newman's work began under I. James Quillen, but when he became dean, Gross took over as dissertation adviser). One can, at least, surmise that the historical dissertation in social studies education was not eschewed at Stanford and may even have held equal sway with the traditional quantitative study. Today, even with the ascendancy of qualitative research historical studies are still not common, though the climate for such work would seem less chilly.

There are certainly other directions that need to be pursued in the foundations of the field of social studies. A greater focus on those people who have shaped the field is needed. Studies on the contributions of Hilda Taba, Harold Rugg, Paul Hanna, James Harvey Robinson and George Counts, among others have been done, though these studies should not be seen as granting closure in studying such people. More studies of social studies educators in the contexts of their contributions to social studies are needed.

More case studies of experimental and/or successful curricular innovation is needed and will continue to be. Extensions of institutional studies like that of Boozer or Hiner would help to shape policy and direction to a field in need of both. Finally, a template like that of Robinson could be structured for examining similar questions (to Robinson's) in a different time period and context.

Social studies continues to be questioned as a field. A compelling argument for its existence and import is knowledge of the foundational work in social studies and what it has sought to accomplish. The cooperative, collaborative quality that characterized the field in its early years needs greater scrutiny. Those collaboratives may hold potential for future successes if they were only to be studied and exploited. The studies described in this essay have done that; there is still much to do.

References

Alilunas, Leo J. (1946). *Genesis of the Social Studies Movement in American Secondary Education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Boozer, Howard R. (1960). *The American Historical Association and the Schools, 1884-1956.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington University, St. Louis.

Correia, Stephen. (1993). *For Their Own Good: An Historical Analysis of the Educational Thought of Thomas Jesse Jones.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Cruikshanks, Andrew N. (1957). *The Social Studies Curriculum in the Secondary School, 1893-1955.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Evans, Ronald W. (1987). *Defining the Worthy Society: A History of the Societal Problems Approach in the Social Studies, 1895-1985.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Glasheen, Patricia. (1973). *The Advent of Social Studies, 1916: An historical Study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University, Boston.

Hiner, Jr. N. Ray. (1967). *The Changing Role of History and Social Sciences in the Schools, 1892-1918.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville.

Kimmell, William. (1932). *Instruction in the Social Studies.* Bulletin No. 17, National Survey of Secondary Education Monograph No. 21, Washington, DC.

Kinzie, Glenn L. (1965). *Historians and the Social Studies: A History and Interpretation of the Activities of the American Historical Association in the Secondary School Social Studies, 1884-1965.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College.

LeRiche, Leo. (1974). *The Widening Horizons Concept in Elementary Social Studies Education, 1903-1965.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington University, St. Louis.

Lybarger, Michael B. (1981). *Origins of the Social Studies Curriculum: 1865-1916.* Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin,.

Nelson, Murry R. (1975). *Building a Science of Society: The Social Studies and Harold O. Rugg.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Nelson, Murry R. (1977). "The Development of the Rugg Social Studies Materials." *Theory and Research in Social Education,* 5, 64-83.

Newman, Jr., Robert E. (1960). *History of a Civic Education Project Implementing the Social Problem Technique of Instruction.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Peet, Thomas S. (1984). *A Selective History of Social Studies Scope and Sequence Patterns, 1916 to 1984.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.

Robinson, D. Paul. (1977). *Historical Models of the Emergence of the Social Studies.* Unpublished dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Roorbach, Agnew O. (1937). *The Development of the Social Studies in American Secondary Education before 1861.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Saxe, David W. (1991). *Social Studies in Schools: A History of the Early Years.* SUNY Press, Albany.

Singleton, H. Wells. (1975). *Factors Affecting the Development of the Problems of Democracy Course.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Vanaria, Louis M. (1958). *The National Council for the Social Studies: A Voluntary Organization for Professional Service.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York.